



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/756,106	01/09/2001	Joseph M. Cannon	Cannon 114-38-20	5625

7590 05/06/2004

William H Bollman
Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC
2000 M Street NW Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-3307

EXAMINER

CRAVER, CHARLES R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2682

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/756,106

Applicant(s)

CANNON ET AL.

Examiner

Charles R Craver

Art Unit

2682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's recent amendment presents claims 1-6 as originally filed, however, claims 1-6 were amended in AMDT A, PTO Paper #8, filed 10-1-03. As such, the examiner issues this office action based on the amended form of claims 1-6 as noted above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson in view of Ziegler.

Claims 7 and 11: Jonsson discloses a method and apparatus for a handheld piconet device, comprising a piconet front-end and means for using a code and providing to said device unique addresses of at least two (FIG) devices associated with the passcode in a common piconet network in response to the code (paragraphs 0028-0031).

Jonsson fails to disclose that the code is based on an entered passcode.

Ziegler discloses the utility of using a user-entered passcode to send an inquiry page such as that taught by Jonsson (col 6 line 34-col 7 line 20). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Jonsson to accept user input, as it would be beneficial in starting the inquiry process, as suggested by Ziegler.

Claims 8 and 12: Jonsson discloses that the addresses are provided by other piconet devices in the network.

Claims 9, 10, 13 and 14: Jonsson discloses a master BLUETOOTH device.

4. Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson in view of Ziegler and Logan.

Claim 1: Jonsson discloses a handheld piconet device, comprising a piconet front-end and a unique address (paragraph 0025), and means for associating a code (reads selection module) with the device and at least one other unique address of another network device (paragraphs 0028-0031).

Jonsson fails to disclose that the code is based on a passcode, or that the passcode is much smaller than the unique address.

Ziegler discloses the utility of using a user-entered unique address to send an inquiry page such as that taught by Jonsson (col 6 line 34-col 7 line 20).

Logan discloses that the aforementioned unique address also has a "user friendly" device name which may be shorter (up to 248 bytes long, compared to a fixed 48 bits,).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Jonsson to accept user input, as it would be beneficial in starting the inquiry

process, as suggested by Ziegler, and to use the shorter Device Name of Logan, as it would be more "user friendly".

Claims 2 and 6: it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to store lists of the received addresses associated with the given passcode, given that Logan discloses that the inquiry is for finding and providing the user with the information (col 4 lines 29-45). **Claims 4 and 5:** Jonsson, Ziegler and Logan all disclose BLUETOOTH systems, which use a 48-bit address.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson in view of Ziegler and Logan as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Mauney, of record.

Jonsson in view of Ziegler and Logan discloses applicant's invention of claim 2, but fails to disclose that the PIN may be selectable from a list.

Mauney discloses a wireless group communicating device similar to that taught by Jonsson, Ziegler and Logan, wherein lists of addresses of other user's devices may be stored in numbers of groups and subgroups for retrieval by the user according to a list of associated passcodes (col 16 lines 6-36, col 29 lines 51-67, col 52 lines 9-21).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the BLUETOOTH system of Jonsson in view of Ziegler and Logan to use the user-friendly system of Mauney, as Logan discloses providing the addresses so that the home device may locate and communicate with other devices, which would be easier for the user with a listing method of Mauney.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lunsford, Larsson, Roundtree and Novakov discuss BLUETOOTH systems.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 for both formal and informal/draft communications, labeled as such.

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121
Crystal Drive, Arlington VA, sixth floor (receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Charles Craver at (703) 305-3965.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin, can be reached at (703) 308-6739.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 305-4700.

Application/Control Number: 09/756,106


Page 6

Art Unit: 2682

CC

C.Craver

April 29, 2004


CHARLES CRAVER
PATENT EXAMINER